Remarks:

The following remarks address the Examiner's detailed action, using corresponding section heading numbers.

1 (no remarks)

2 (Regarding the drawings) -- With this paper, paragraph {023} is amended to include reference to elements 222, 232 and 255, and paragraph {018} is amended to include reference to elements 252 and 253.

3 (Regarding the specification) -- Paragraph {018} is amended to correct the use of reference numerals 205 and 206. Regarding paragraph {025}, Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner's comment about a missing period. The words of paragraph {025} are a single sentence, having an introductory clause that begins with "Note that" and ends with "scripts," as indicated by the word "whilst." As amended here, a comma is inserted after the word "scripts" to set-off this clause more clearly. Paragraph {025} is amended to change the word "is" to the word "it".

4 (Regarding the use of trademarks) -- Paragraphs {003}, {018}, {021}, {022}, {023}, {025}, and {026} are amended to capitalize all the letters of each trademark and to recite generic terminology for each.

5 (Claim Objections) -- Claims 1 and 11 are amended to include the word "and" at the end of the next-to-last limitation of each. Claims 5-10 and 15 are canceled. Claim 11 is amended to delete the words "comprising the steps".

6 (no remarks)

7 (Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112) -- Claims 1, 4, 11, and 14 are amended to address the alleged lack of antecedents Claims 5-10 and 15 are canceled.

8 (no remarks)

9 (Claim Rejections under 35 USC 101) -- Independent claim 1 is amended to specify that the method and the scripting tool are computer implemented, thus tangibly embodying this claim, as well as independent claims 2-4. Claims 5-10 are canceled. Independent claim 11 is amended to specify "a computer usable medium having computer usable program code tangibly embodied therein," thus tangibly embodying and associating a tangible medium with claim 11 as well as with its independent claims 12-14. Claim 15 is canceled.

10 (no remarks)

11 (Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102) -- Applicant's invention concerns generating a script responsive to an indication of a scripting language, whereas Guinart concerns collecting already generated scripts into a single file. Guinart does not teach generating scripts, and cannot be

applied to solve the problem addressed by Applicant's invention. Applicant's independent claims 1 and 11 are amended by this paper to more clearly point out this distinction. Thus Applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 11, as amended here, are patentable over Guinart. Regarding Examiner's statements about means-plus-function interpretation under 35 U.S.C 112: this issue is now moot, as Applicant's claims 6-10 are canceled by this paper.

12 (no remarks)

13 (Claim Rejections under 35 USC 103) -- As argued above, Applicant believes that dependent claims 1 and 11, as amended by this paper, are patentable, and so therefore are the respective dependent claims 2-4 and 12-14.

Summary: For the reasons given above, applicant believes that independent claims 1 and 11, as amended here, are patentable, and thus the respective dependent claims 2-4 and 12-14, as amended here, are also patentable. Consequently, Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to allow claims 1-4 and 11-14, as amended by this paper. Applicant sincerely thanks Examiner, and requests that the application now pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

By: David R. Irvin

David R. Irvin

Reg. No. 42,682